## Attachment to Independent Case Review Report For CDRU # <u>6561</u> Case file # <u>95-260456</u>.

Material Examiner:

Malone (RQ)

Remarks:

•

-

.

.

Case resulted in a trial, testimony transcript not provided.

.

· · ·

## Crm 147

4

## INDEPENDENT CASE REVIEW REPORT

Area(s) of Expertis	e: Hair and Fi	bers		•	
Review commences	d at: 10:45 AM	( (Time),	11/06/01	(Date)	
File #: 95-2604	56				
Laboratory #(s):	40329004				
-					
		Eveninor(c	) & Symbols		
		Examiner(s	s) & Symbols		
	Reviewed	Examiner(s Not Reviewed	s) & Symbols	Reviewed	Not Reviewed
			s) & Symbols	Reviewed	Not Reviewed
<u>RQ</u>	Reviewed	Not Reviewed	s) & Symbols		
RQ	Reviewed	Not Reviewed	s) & Symbols	D	G
<u>RQ</u>	Reviewed X	Not Reviewed	s) & Symbols	Cł	
RQ	Reviewed Xo O	Not Reviewed		Cł	

Laboratory	Report(s):
------------	------------

L.

•


Laboratory Number:	403290004	Date:	June 18, 1984
Laboratory Number:		Date:	
Laboratory Number:	····	Date:	· · ·
Examiner Bench Notes of:	RQ and unknown technician		
Laboratory Number:	40329004		
	Page 1 of 3		
-	Initials: Sur		Crm147A
·····			

•

	es, please identify and/or desc		y letter dated 3-22-84
	· · ·	Results of Review	
File	#: 95-260456	Item or Specimen # Reviewed	<b>i</b> : Q1-Q7, Q10, Q17-Q25, Q27,
		Numbered comments are required b ges for any "No" or "Unable to Dete	
!)	<u>^</u>	the appropriate tests in a scientifically alytic techniques available at the time	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
1) 2)	methods, protocols, and an	alytic techniques available at the time Yes  No s set forth in the laboratory report(s) s	e of the original examination(s)?
	methods, protocols, and an Are the examination result	alytic techniques available at the time Yes  No s set forth in the laboratory report(s) s	e of the original examination(s)? X  up Unable to Determine upported and adequately documented in

XD Transcript not available.

- 3) Testimony consistent with the laboratory report(s)?
- 4) Testimony consistent with the bench notes?
- 5) Testimony within bounds of examiner's expertise?



## Comments (Set forth by above question #, if applicable. Use "Additional Comments" Sheet, if needed)

File #: 95-260456

#1: With microscopic hair comparison, one cannot determine from the notes that the examination was conducted

in an appropriate manner.

#2: Documentation is poor. The notes are not dated and are in pencil and not ink. Abbreviations are used to describe the microscopic characteristics of the hair. These abbreviations are difficult to interpret. There is no documentation by the technician that hair was recovered from Q1 or Q2 as stated in the report. The report states "One brown pubic hair of Caucasian origin was found in specimen Q27. This hair microscopically matches the pubic hair of the victim." The examiner's notes for item Q27, the suspect' pubic combings, read "Q27- Sev b P.H's C.O=K6(s) \*1 b P.H CO F. rem = K6(s) \*K3(v)". These notes indicate that more than one pubic hair was recovered from Q27. In addition, these notes indicate that one hair from Q27 matches the suspect's pubic hair sample (K6) instead of the victim's pubic hair sample (K3).

Review completed at: 11:30 AM (Time), 11/06/01 (Date)

Total time spent conducting review (to nearest 1/4 hour):

0.75 hr.

I hereby certify that I conducted this review in an independent, unbiased manner and that the results of my review are fully documented on this report consisting of a total of  $3_{\text{pages}}$ .

(Signature)

11/06/2001

(Date)

$$#$$
 For CLARIFICATION, THIS READS "= K3CV)", MCANING this  
hair DOES NOT MATCH THE K3 SAMPLE.  
Such  
Page 3 of 3  
Initials: Such